

## **NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC**

Good evening, my name is Marti Wachtel, and I am the Chair of the Historic Landmarks Commission. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to welcome you to tonight's meeting. I will now call to order the May 1, 2002, meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission.

- A. To arrange an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate in this public meeting, please call either (408) 277-4576 or (408) 998-5299 (TTY) at least two business days before the meeting.
- B. When addressing the Commission, please approach the Commission, identify yourself and state your address for our records. After you have finished speaking, please write your name and address on the speaker's list at the end of the table.
- C. The procedure for public hearings is as follows:
  - After the staff report, applicants may make a five-minute presentation.
  - Anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposal should prepare to come forward. Each speaker will have two minutes.
  - After the proponents speak, anyone wishing to speak in opposition should prepare to come forward. Each speaker will have two minutes.
  - Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
  - The Commission will then close the public hearing. The Historic Landmarks Commission will take action on the item.
- D. The procedure for referrals is as follows:
  - Anyone wishing to speak on a referral will be limited to one minute.
  - Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
  - The Historic Landmarks Commission will comment on the referral item.
- E. If a Commissioner would like a topic to be addressed under one of the Good and Welfare items, please contact Planning staff in advance of the Commission meeting.

An agenda and a copy of all staff reports have been placed on the end of the table for your convenience.

AGENDA  
ORDER OF BUSINESS

**1. ROLL CALL**

**2. CONSENT CALENDAR**

The Commission will take action on the consent calendar in one motion. If you want to speak on a consent calendar item, or want action other than that indicated, please make your request at this time.

- a. Approval of the April 3, 2002 Synopsis

**The Commission unanimously voted to adopt the April synopsis with the following changes: at the top of Page 4, item 5b should read Manager, not Manger (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

**3. ORAL PETITIONS**

This portion of the agenda is reserved for persons desiring to address the Commission on any matter not on the agenda. Speakers are limited to 2 minutes. The law does not permit Commission action or extended discussion on any item not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Commission action is requested, the matter can be placed on the next agenda. All statements that require a response will be referred to staff for reply in writing.

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. HP01-04-004. Historic Preservation Permit for a project located at north side of Bassett Street, approximately 800 feet west of Terraine Street on a 0.11-gross-acre site in the IP Industrial Park Zoning District for seismic upgrades and exterior changes to the John Stock and Son Warehouse (City Landmark No: HL 92-68). Exterior changes include URM structural bolts and washers, new entry door, and new windows. (Charles Hackett, Owner; Stephen Arnold, Applicant) Council District 3. CEQA: Exempt.

**Sally Zarnowitz reported that planning staff has worked with the applicant and the building division in order to reduce the number of through-bolts on significant portions of the façade by alternating interior-installed epoxy bolts with through bolts. The engineer presented revised drawings indicating the removal of the bands from the front and rear facades of the building, and an increase in the spacing of the through-bolts to six-feet on center. The engineer told the commission that every effort would be made to space the bolts such that no through-bolts would be installed through the arch at the entry.**

**Commissioner Wachtel commended the applicant for working with staff to come to an improved solution. She asked whether the bolts and washers would be painted to blend into the signage. The applicant answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Polcyn reinforced the request for the bolts to be painted-out to blend with the signage and the masonry. Commissioners Polcyn made a motion to approve the project as re-submitted and Commissioner Dunning seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted in favor of the motion (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

- b. HL02-145. San Jose Historic Landmark designation of the Arthur Monroe Free House located at 66 S. 14<sup>th</sup> St. Owner: William G. Robson. CEQA: Exempt. Council District: 3.

**The commission unanimously voted in favor of recommending the City Council designate the Arthur Monroe Free House as a City Landmark based on its association with Arthur Monroe Free. (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

## **5. REFERRALS TO THE COMMISSION**

- a. PD 98-04-028. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for a project located the east side of U.S. 101, approximately 1,000 feet northerly of Hellyer Avenue on a 578-gross-acre site in the A(PD) Planned Development Zoning District to allow up to 528 attached and detached residential uses, a golf course and a City park. Presley Homes, Owner/Developer). Council District 8. EIR Resolution # 64913.

**Courtney Damkroger introduced the project. She noted that the applicant has agreed to use materials from the Dairy Barn to repair and rehabilitate the historic Hassler barn.**

**Commissioner Paim asked where the Hassler barn is located. The applicant responded that it was located to the south of the project. Paim suggested that the site plan for this project be extended to indicate the location of the Hassler barn. She continued that it was too bad to lose a Contributing Structure, but that probably the salvage and recycling of the Dairy Barn was good mitigation and that the project should incorporate salvage of all the structures prior to demolition of any building.**

**Commissioner Dunning made a motion to approve the project with the conditions recommended by staff:**

- **The Dairy barn be carefully salvaged and recycled for use in the repair of the Hassler barn**
- **A qualified preservation architect be consulted prior to the demolition of the Dairy Barn in order to ensure proper salvage methods**
- **Three original copies of the Historic Report be provided to the Department of Planning, building and Code Enforcement for filing at area archives**

**And with the following conditions :**

- **A qualified preservation architect evaluate all eight buildings prior to demolition for their salvage potential and for proper salvage methods**
- **History San Jose and Prusch park be contacted to determine whether they are interested in the buildings**

**Commissioner Polcyn seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted in favor of the motion (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

- b. PDCSH 01-09-093. Planned Development Rezoning from IP-Industrial Park to A(PD) Planned Development to allow approximately 1,494, 700 square feet of industrial and research and development uses, including communication service exchange facilities, a private back-up power generation and electrical substation, commercial support uses, recreational facilities for the employees, and associated surface and garage parking facilities, on approximately 79 acres, located at the northerly side of State Route 85, and westerly of Monterey Highway. (iStar San Jose, LLC, Owner, Equinix, Developer). Council District 2. CEQA: Pending.

**Courtney Damkroger introduced the rezoning. She stated that Christopher Ranch was not identified in the Historic Resources Inventory. The requested Historic Report found that the fruit dehydrator building (ca 1928) qualified for City Landmark status given its association with a technological shift in the fruit packing industry and its association with Ole Christopher and the Christopher family (persons of local significance). She further stated that the Addendum discussed other buildings, which were not found to be significant, either standing alone or as a whole.**

**Todd Raggonini, representing the applicant, stated that the fruit dehydrator would be incorporated into the design of the project.**

**The commission asked how the building would be retained and used by the public. The applicant's representative responded that it would be located on a drive aisle on the property, and that the possibility of allowing public access would depend on the future tenants' needs.**

**Commissioner Youmans asked whether part of the orchard would be left intact. The representative answered that it would not. He stated that the plans indicate the extent of new landscaping which would preserve Oak and Redwood ordinance size trees.**

**Commissioner Youmans stated further that he was troubled by the fact that the project proposed no clear public access to the fruit dehydrator building. He referred to a Hewlett Packard campus on Wolfe and Homestead that allows public**

access with due notice for visits and events, and stated that this is clearly “a large slice of the agrarian landscape.” He also expressed a concern about retaining the Christopher children’s writings in concrete. The representative responded that it would be difficult to guarantee public access or preservation of the writings at the zoning stage.

**Commissioner Dunning recommended approval of the project with staff’s recommendations:**

- **State a preference for preservation of the dehydrator in place,**
- **Recommend the use of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to guide preservation and/or reuse of the dehydrator,**
- **Include an interpretative display of historic photos, machinery and other materials at the site,**
- **Encourage the owners to apply for City Landmark designation,**
- **Request that the project return to the Commission at the time of the Development Permit in order to review and comment on the final plans for preservation and interpretation.**

**And adding:**

- **Document and salvage the concrete slab with the children’s writing to be incorporated into the interpretive display**
- **Provide public access to the public at the development permit stage.**

**Commissioner Youmans seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted in favor of the motion (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

## **6. GENERAL BUSINESS**

- a. **Nomination of the 89 Pierce as a City Landmark**

**Courtney Damkroger introduced the request. Ellen Garboske of Preservation Action Council of San Jose spoke in favor of the nomination.**

**Commissioner Dunning commented that while “It is hard to say no” to a request for City Landmark, this property does not have the significance of 1818 The Alameda. Commissioner Polcyn noted that if there are any questions as to authenticity the information in the Historic Report, the property should not be nominated as a City Landmark.**

**Commissioner Paim stated that it would be unfortunate to deny the request based on the disagreement of the consultants. Commissioner Dunning**

**responded that the second evaluator had access to the interior, where the first did not.**

**Commissioners Polcyn and Dunning noted that the ARM report should be corrected to reflect that the structure is not associated with an important person.**

**Commissioner Pain made a motion to recommend that the City Council initiate proceedings to designate the building at 89 Pierce Avenue as a City Landmark and that the Historic Report be corrected. Polcyn seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted in favor of the motion (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

- b. Nomination of the 1818 The Alameda as a City Landmark

**Courtney Damkroger introduced the nomination. Commissioner Dunning made a motion that the Historic Landmarks Commission recommend that the City Council initiate proceedings to designate the building at 1818 The Alameda as a City Landmark. Commissioner Youmans seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously voted in favor of the motion (5-0-2 Sciara and Legaspi absent).**

- c. Discussion regarding April 3, Conservation Area Study Session recommendations to Planning Commission

**Courtney Damkroger announced that the Planning Commission would have a study session on Conservation Areas on May 22, 2002 from 4:30-5:30 PM in order to discuss the proposed draft program which will go to City Council in June of 2002. Information about the Conservation Area study is available on the Planning Division web site @ [www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/planning/sjplan](http://www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/planning/sjplan) and staff will be attending Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI) meetings to speak about Conservation Areas in the near future.**

- d. Discussion of Landmark Commission Comments on the Century Center Redevelopment Area Plan and Mixed Use EIR.

**Courtney Damkroger reported that on April 18<sup>th</sup> the Historic Landmarks Commission held a public meeting in order to compose written comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Mixed-Use Project and Century Center Plan Amendment which is scheduled to be considered for certification at the May 22, 2002 Planning Commission Hearing. The commissioners thanked Lori Moniz for her excellent assistance in the process.**

- e. St James Park Master Plan Update

**Edith Ramirez presented a site plan for the park, and reported on the St. James Park Plan task force meetings. She explained that the parking management plan recommended that there be no garage under the park. She also noted that the two choices for relocation of the senior center are the First Church of Christ Scientist and the Guitar Showcase on north First at St. John Street.**

**Chair Wachtel asked about the armory site for the senior center. Ms. Ramirez responded that the senior center wanted a site fronting the park. Chair Wachtel asked about the possibility of using kiosks instead of permanent public restrooms. Ms. Ramirez clarified that the consultant recommended that restrooms be properly designed with a prominent public orientation in order to attract people to the park, which in turn provides security or “eyes on” the park. Jim Norman from the Department of Parks and Recreation further explained that in a recent survey of city residents, 77-87% rated restrooms and trails as their highest priority for improvement of the city’s parks. The task force saw the risk of installing restrooms as one required to increase the number of users.**

**Commissioner Paim asked whether part of security was increasing the number of people at the site. Parks and Recreation responded that it was, and that the recently installed playground has helped by changing the character of the park.**

- f. **Proposed Rehabilitation of the Le Fevre House and Barn at Emma Prusch Memorial Park**

**Courtney Damkroger introduced the project and explained that the HABS documentation was available for commissioners to review as well as a copy of the 1992 master plan for the park which notes the relocation of the house and barn.**

**Consultants Darryl Allen and Gil Sanchez presented the project.**

**Commissioner Paim asked for a clarification as to whether the full size 2x4 framing allowed the structural retrofit within the thickness of the existing wall. Mr. Sanchez replied that it did. Commissioner Youmans asked whether anything was left of the sunroom. Mr. Sanchez replied that the existing windows, railings and plaster would be restored.**

**The commission thanked the project manager for the photography and commended both him and the architect for a good presentation and project.**

- g. **Discussion regarding Cinnabar Commons Draft EIR**

**Courtney Damkroger introduced the Planned Development Rezoning and the Draft EIR. She noted that the Draft EIR was currently circulating, and that the deadline for comments would be May 6, 2002.**

**No one spoke in favor of the project.**

**Adele Poenish spoke in opposition to the project, stating that the existing building complements the neighborhood and could be re-used successfully as a grocery store. She noted that the Midtown Plan was designed to create a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, but that there was no accessible grocery store. She also noted that the neighborhood would be active in protecting itself from cross-traffic.**

**Michelle McGurk and Laura Winter of the Shasta Hanchett Neighborhood Association Land Use Development Committee also spoke in opposition to the project. They stated that the committee had requested a meeting with the developer and had not gotten a response. They believed that there was a failure in City Hall communications regarding this project. They reported on a community meeting at Hester Elementary School and recommended the following:**

- 1. That at least the two oldest buildings (buildings A & B) be saved.**
- 2. That ideally buildings A & B would be re-used as artist live-work spaces.**
- 3. That the developer hire an historic preservation architect to review the project.**
- 4. The Historic Landmarks Commission review the historic preservation architect's recommendations prior to the approval of the rezoning.**

**Representatives from PACSJ asked whether the deadline for comments was really May 6th. Britta Buys, the Planning Implementation Project Manager stated that the EIR and the Planned Development Rezoning were scheduled for the May 22, 2002 Planning Commission Hearing.**

**Chair Wachtel suggested that the commissioners work with Lori Moniz to compose comments, as they did on the Mixed-Use Project and Century City Plan Amendment Draft EIR.**

**Larry Stone, a partner in the development team, noted that the General Plan Land Use Designation for the site was Residential Support for the Core Area: 25+ Dwelling Units Per Acre.**

**Commissioners Dunning and Wachtel noted that they did not recall being notified that the Historic Report was on file, and that in the future they would like to be notified of any EIR that contains a historic resources, including historic archeology.**

**A representative from PACSJ asked whether the commission could request an extension on the circulation period. Commissioner Paim asked what the required length of the circulation period was, and Courtney Damkroger**



**answered that for this project it was 30 days, and that Environmental Impact Reports are available on the Planning Division website.**

**Commissioner Emeritus Henderson asked whether the Planned Development Rezoning would come before the Historic Landmarks Commission. Chair Wachtel noted the Del Monte factory project as an example of the development community working with the community and the neighborhood to create a successful project, and further stated that she was concerned about an effort to fast-track this project.**

**It was proposed that the Commission schedule a meeting on Friday, May 10<sup>th</sup> from 3:30pm-5:30pm at the Redevelopment Agency Board Room, in order to compose comments on the Draft EIR for the Rezoning.**

## **7. GOOD AND WELFARE**

### **a. Report from the Redevelopment Agency**

- **Downtown Historic Commercial District Design Guidelines**

**Dolores Mellon reported that the consultant was working revisions to the guidelines, and that there was no deadline in site at this time.**

- **St James Design Guidelines**

**Dolores Mellon reported that she hoped to have something for design review submittal with the next few weeks.**

- **History Walk sign for Germania Building**

**Ms. Mellon reported that the sign had been completed and that she had a photo of the sign. She was not sure when it would be installed.**

- **Diridon/Arena Strategic Development Plan**

**Ms. Mellon reported that the second meeting would be held on May 30<sup>th</sup>, but that no location had been set yet.**

- **SoFA Strategic Development Plan**

**No Report**

- **340 N San Pedro**

**Ms. Mellon reported that demolition plans for the Bike Barn had been dropped-off at the Planning Division for CEQA review.**

**Ms. Damkroger noted that PACSJ had written a letter opposing demolition and that the Historic Landmarks Commission had made specific comments in opposition to the demolition at the July 2001 meeting.**

**There were no additional comments on the proposed demolition.**

b. Report from the Secretary

- California Preservation Foundation conference

**Ms. Damkroger noted that the Planning Division was currently processing requests from commissioners for conference fee payments.**

- Mark's Hot Dogs

**Sally Zarnowitz reported that the Conditional Use Permit and Historic Preservation Permit for the relocation of "The Orange" had expired, and that she would be the project manager responsible for the new permits.**

- Form 700

**Ms. Damkroger noted that these forms were now past due if commissioners had not turned them in.**

**Ms. Damkroger interjected that on May 14, 2002 @ 1:30pm, the City Council would kick-off Historic Preservation Week, and that PACSJ would kick-off the week with a walking tour of Naglee Park on Saturday, May 11, 2002.**

c. Report from the Subcommittees

- Historic Preservation Guidelines Process

**No Report**

- Standard permit language for Historical Archeology

**Commissioner Dunning reported that the committee was going to meet with the intern in May.**

- St. James Park

**No Report**

- Survey Committee

**Ms. Damkroger reminded the commission that the meetings were every other Thursday from 5:00-6:30pm, and that the next meeting would be held on May 9<sup>th</sup>.**

d. Written Petitions and Communications

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

C: Dolores Mellon, SJRA  
Edith Ramirez, SJRA  
Britta Buys, PBCE  
John Davidson, PBCE  
Jeff Roche, PBCE  
John Baty, PBCE  
Daniel Phan, Public Works  
PBCE002/historic/5-1-02agenda

